

**EXHIBIT 1**  
**FILED UNDER SEAL**

CLEMENT SETH ROBERTS (STATE BAR NO. 209203)  
croberts@orrick.com  
BAS DE BLANK (STATE BAR NO. 191487)  
basdeblank@orrick.com  
ALYSSA CARIDIS (STATE BAR NO. 260103)  
acaridis@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: +1 415 773 5700  
Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

GEORGE I. LEE (*pro hac vice in process*)  
lee@ls3ip.com  
SEAN M. SULLIVAN (*admitted pro hac*)  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
RORY P. SHEA (*pro hac vice in process*)  
shea@ls3ip.com  
J. DAN SMITH (*pro hac vice in process*)  
smith@ls3ip.com  
Cole B. Richter (*admitted pro hac*)  
richter@ls3ip.com  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Telephone: +1 312 754 0002  
Facsimile: +1 312 754 0003

*Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GOOGLE LLC,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

SONOS, INC.,

*Defendant.*

Case No. 3:20-cv-6754

**SONOS, INC.’S PRELIMINARY  
DAMAGES DISCLOSURE PURSUANT  
TO PATENT LOCAL RULE 3-8**

Honorable William Alsup

1 Pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-8, Sonos, Inc. (“Sonos”) submits these Preliminary  
2 Damages Contentions. No claim construction has taken place in this case, and only limited  
3 discovery is currently available. Indeed, merits discovery in this action is just getting started and,  
4 as of the date of service of these contentions, is not scheduled to close until November 30, 2022.  
5 To date, Google has also not produced sufficient documents responsive to Sonos’s document  
6 requests and no depositions have been taken. Likewise, Google’s interrogatory responses are  
7 woefully deficient in many respects and completely non-responsive in others. As a non-limiting  
8 example, in response to Sonos’s interrogatory asking Google to explain each “revenue stream  
9 connected to and/or promoted by the Accused Instrumentalities,” Google failed to provide a  
10 substantive response and merely stated that “Google is willing to meet and confer to clarify and  
11 narrow the scope of this request.” Without the benefit of proper and additional discovery  
12 responses from Google, Sonos cannot provide fulsome responses to the disclosures required by  
13 Patent Local Rule 3-8.

14 This disclosure is based upon Sonos’s own information as well as the limited information  
15 produced by Google, LLC (“Google”) to date in this case and information Sonos has been able to  
16 obtain from public sources, together with Sonos’s good faith beliefs regarding the Accused  
17 Instrumentalities in this case. The damages theories contained herein are preliminary only and  
18 are not intended to be binding, exclusive, or exhaustive. Sonos’s investigation is ongoing and its  
19 ultimate damages theories in this case will require extensive analysis by Sonos’s damages expert.

20 Accordingly, Sonos reserves the right to supplement, amend, or modify these disclosures  
21 based on the Court’s claim construction, its continuing review of information produced by  
22 Google, its review of information requested from but not yet produced by Google, depositions  
23 related to such information, positions taken by Google in this or other litigation, publicly  
24 available information, additional information produced in this case through formal discovery or  
25 otherwise, expert analysis, and/or for any other permissible reasons under the Local Rules and  
26 Patent Local Rules of this Court or the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and as the Court may  
27 permit.  
28

Moreover, these damages contentions address only those patent claims and Accused Instrumentalities identified in Sonos’s Patent Local Rule 3-1 infringement contentions.<sup>1</sup> As such, for purposes of this disclosure under Patent Local Rule 3-8, common terms like “Asserted Claims,” “Asserted Patents,” and “Accused Instrumentalities” should be understood to have the same meanings as set forth in Sonos’s Patent Local Rule 3-1 infringement contentions.<sup>2</sup> Sonos’s Patent Local Rule 3-1 infringement contentions (and all amendments thereto) are incorporated herein by reference.

Sonos expressly reserves all objections regarding the use of this preliminary disclosure, for any purpose, and does not waive any applicable privileges. Sonos also reserves the right to rely on any facts, method, or analysis that Google offers in any proceeding between Sonos and Google. Sonos further reserves the right to rely on any evidence that Google relies on in, or creates for the purposes of, any proceeding between Sonos and Google.

**I. Legal Background**

Pursuant to Local Patent Rule 3-8(a), Sonos’s Preliminary Damages Contentions, as set forth in detail below, will “[i]dentify each of the category(-ies) of damages it is seeking for the asserted infringement, as well as its theories of recovery, factual support for those theories, and computations of damages within each category, including:

- 1) Lost profits;
- 2) Price erosion;
- 3) Convoyed or collateral sales;
- 4) Reasonable royalty; and
- 5) Any other form of damages.”

“Local Rule 3-8 does not require certainty, and it is not fairly interpreted as replacing the robust analysis of a patent damages expert report.” *Twilio, Inc. v. Telesign Corp.*, Case No. 16-

---

<sup>1</sup> Sonos has asserted claims against Google from the following patents: U.S. Patent Nos. 9,967,615 (the “’615 Patent”), 10,779,033 (the “’033 Patent”), 10,469,966 (the “’966 Patent”), and 10,848,885 (the “’885 Patent”) (collectively, “the Asserted Patents”).

<sup>2</sup> For purposes of this disclosure, a reference to “Accused Instrumentalities” shall also be understood to include the accused Cast-enabled apps and/or the Google Home app, either individually or collectively with the smartphone, tablet, or computer devices on which such apps are installed (or to be installed).

1 Home Hub, Nest Hub, and Nest Hub Max; and (x) revenue associated with consumer data  
2 collected via Google’s Home Hub, Nest Hub, and Nest Hub Max.

3 Thus, as endorsed by Google, applying a standard industry royalty rate, e.g., the 4%  
4 electrical and electronics industry royalty rate from IPSCIO, to the revenue generated/derived by  
5 the Accused Instrumentalities, [REDACTED]

6 [REDACTED]  
7 [REDACTED]  
8 [REDACTED] results in a  
9 reasonable royalty award of [REDACTED] See GOOG-  
10 SONOSNDCA-00055305.

11 As explained herein, however, Google has not provided all the revenue generated/derived  
12 by the Accused Instrumentalities, and thus, this is likely an incomplete estimate of the reasonable  
13 royalty under the Market Approach.

14 A similar Market Approach analysis to that set forth above could be applied for the other  
15 Asserted Patents with adjustments being made for the relevant damages period.<sup>5</sup>

16 As set forth below, pursuant to Patent Local Rule 3-8(b), Sonos contends it is unable to  
17 provide a more fulsome response regarding the Market Approach without additional discovery  
18 from Google, as well as expert opinion on the relevance and comparability of identified  
19 transactions, agreements, and industry information.

### 20 **3. Income Approach**

21 The Income Approach identifies the expected and/or actual financial benefit to the  
22 licensee from the exploitation of the Asserted Patents. The Income Approach is generally  
23 regarded as the most common approach for patent valuation because it is directed to estimating

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>5</sup> For its earlier estimate in the Joint Case Management Statement, Sonos used an ultra-  
26 conservative and simplified approach to estimate damages by applying a 4% industry royalty rate  
27 to Google’s reported [REDACTED] (which is the clearest and  
28 most detailed financials that Google has provided in this case) for the fullest infringement period  
(2018-Q3 through 2021-Q3) in Google’s financials, which resulted in a damages award of  
[REDACTED]. However, as explained herein, this conservative revenue figure does not reflect  
the total revenue generated/derived by the Accused Instrumentalities, which Google has not yet  
provided.

1 Dated: January 25, 2022

LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP

2 By: /s/ Sean M. Sullivan

3 Sean M. Sullivan (*admitted pro hac*)

4 Clement Seth Roberts (SBN 209203)  
5 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
6 405 Howard St.  
7 San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: 415.773.5484; Fax: 415.773.5759  
croberts@orrick.com

8 Bas de Blank (SBN 191487)  
9 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
10 1000 Marsh Blvd.  
11 Menlo Park, CA 94205  
Telephone: 650.614.7343; Fax: 650.614.7401  
bdeblank@orrick.com

12 Alyssa Caridis (SBN 260103)  
13 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
14 777 South Figueroa St., Suite 3200  
15 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: 213.612.2372; Fax: 213.612.2499  
acaridis@orrick.com

16 George I. Lee (*pro hac pending*)  
17 Sean M. Sullivan (*admitted pro hac*)  
18 Rory P. Shea (*pro hac pending*)  
19 J. Dan Smith (*pro hac pending*)  
20 Michael P. Boyea (*pro hac pending*)  
21 Cole B. Richter (*admitted pro hac*)  
22 LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
23 656 W. Randolph St., Floor 5W  
24 Chicago, IL 60661  
25 Telephone: 312.754.9602; Fax: 312.754.9603  
lee@ls3ip.com  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
shea@ls3ip.com  
smith@ls3ip.com  
boyea@ls3ip.com  
richter@ls3ip.com

26 *Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document was served on counsel for Google, LLC via electronic delivery on January 25, 2022.

Dated: January 25, 2022

LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP

By: /s/ Sean M. Sullivan

Sean M. Sullivan (*admitted pro hac*)  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W. Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Telephone: 312.754.9602; Fax: 312.754.9603  
sullivan@ls3ip.com

*Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*